

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 2006

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I support final passage of this pension legislation because we must do something today to protect working families so that the pension promises that were made to them are honored. I am proud today to stand with the employees and groups who are in support of this legislation, including the Affiliated Unions of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, International Association of Machinists, UNITE/HERE, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and many others. And, I join with all of my Republican and Democratic colleagues from the Minnesota delegation in broad bipartisan support for this bill.

Without this legislation, Northwest Airlines, a major Minnesota-based employer and key player in the economic vitality of the region, will not be able to come out of bankruptcy with its pension plans intact. I support this legislation because it will help to ensure Northwest Airlines keeps flying and that their employees can keep working and ensure that their pensions are funded.

This bill is not perfect. In addition to much needed relief for airline employees, this bill includes provisions that will make it easier for working families to save for their retirements by encouraging automatic enrollment in retirement savings. It is critical that families are supported in their efforts to create a strong foundation of savings for their futures.

Working men and women have waited far too long for Congress to pass legislation to protect pension benefits and to honor the promise of pensions. Pension legislation should have been done many months ago. This Congress's failure to act in a more timely way will potentially make worse current and future employer bankruptcies and will impact the strength of all retirement benefits. It is shameful that this Republican Congress has put partisan politics ahead of the well-being of working men and women and those who have already retired.

I am concerned that this pension bill before us today has been introduced with no notice and there has been no opportunity for Members to review the provisions. Instead of bringing forward the bill that Congress has been working on now for more than a year, House Republicans have brought this bill forward.

It is outrageous that House Democrats were excluded in the conference committee negotiations between the House and the Senate. After missing three deadlines to complete their work, House Republicans, instead, were more interested in thinking of ways to attach their extreme tax cuts for America's wealthiest onto what should have been clean, common sense, bipartisan legislation. Their tactics were so ex-

treme that their colleagues in the Senate were unwilling to go along with it. So, here we are now at the eleventh hour doing what we can to salvage pension legislation.

Today, I wish I were rising to support passage of a bill that will guarantee quick action to save the pensions of millions of workers, but instead, once again, partisan politics will slow down the much needed action on pension reform. Even with House passage of the bill, we can't guarantee anything to America's workers because this legislation was taken from the conference committee and now it must pass the Senate with no changes in order for it to move to the President's desk for his approval. If the Senate wants to change anything in the bill, American workers will have to continue to wait for Congress to act.

I do share some of the concerns expressed by my colleagues. There are some missed opportunities—including the failure to address executive compensation and provisions concerning the investment advice for those who have 401(K) plans and IRAS. The investment advice exemptions in the bill do not adequately protect against conflicted investment advice.

Despite some legitimate reservations voiced by groups I respect, this bill contains good provisions—important provisions that must be passed now so that employers can keep the pension promises made to their employees.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 503—TO AMEND THE HORSE PROTECTION ACT TO PROHIBIT THE SHIPPING, TRANSPORTING, MOVING, DELIVERING, RECEIVING, POSSESSING, PURCHASING, SELLING, OR DONATION OF HORSES AND OTHER EQUINES TO BE SLAUGHTERED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 2006

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has announced that it may meet the week of September 4th to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of the bill H.R. 503, to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H-312 of the Capitol by 11 a.m. on Wednesday, September 6, 2006. A copy of the form used for submitting amendments to the Rules Committee is on the back of this letter. Mem-

bers should draft their amendments to the bill as introduced on February 1, 2005.

Members are also encouraged to submit an electronic copy of the amendment either via the committee's web page (http://www.rules.house.gov/amendment_form.asp) or by e-mailing an electronic copy of the amendment to rules.amendments@mail.house.gov. Anyone e-mailing an electronic copy of an amendment should include the bill number and amendment sponsor in the subject of the e-mail, as well as a copy of the summary in the body of the e-mail. Electronic submission of an amendment does not relieve a Member of filing the amendment with the committee as explained above.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House. If you have any questions, please contact me or George Rogers at extension 5-9191.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 2006

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to record my rollcall votes 421-423.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on votes 421 and 423.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on vote 422.

HONORING FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS THOMAS J. MANTON

SPEECH OF

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2006

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my sentiments to the words that have been spoken already. I associate myself with the remarks that have been made about Tom Manton.

Tom Manton was a political leader in an adjacent county, the Borough of Queens. In the Borough of Brooklyn we had what we call a first-rate political machine, and in view of the fact that we have been discussing power-sharing and the Voting Rights Act, I remember dramatically seeing the difference between Brooklyn and Queens.

As a leader in Queens, Tom Manton believed in power-sharing. Minorities did not have to fight to get what they deserved in Queens. Harmony was not established only after a big battle was waged and the spoils were settled. In Brooklyn we had to battle for everything. We had to fight all the way.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.